



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

jm
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/987,909	11/16/2001	Isao Kameyama	011524	7934
23850	7590	08/16/2004	EXAMINER	
ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP 1725 K STREET, NW SUITE 1000 WASHINGTON, DC 20006			LUEBKE, RENEE S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2833	

DATE MAILED: 08/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/987,909

Applicant(s)

KAMEYAMA & TAKAHASHI

Examiner

Renee S. Luebke

Art Unit

2833

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8 and 9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 November 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/16/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2833

1. The drawings are objected to because the section lines (i.e. P-P) should indicate where the section view is to be found (i.e. 4-4). Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application.

Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. The disclosure, abstract and claims are objected to because of the non-idiomatic English in which they are written. Appropriate correction is required.

3. The very lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting all errors of which applicant may become aware in the application.

4. Claims 1-9 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- The meaning and intent of "as a connector" on line 9 of claims 1 and 7 is indefinite.

- On line 10 of claims 1 and 7, it appears that "having" should be -have-.

- On line 11 of claims 1 and 7, it appears that -a- should be inserted after "with."

Art Unit: 2833

- The beginning of claim 2 is redundant, repeating limitations now found in claim 1.

- The term "type" online 2 of claim 2 renders the claim indefinite because the claim includes elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by the "type"), thereby rendering the scope of the claims unascertainable.

- Claim 2 lacks antecedent basis for "said contact" on line 5.

- Claim 7 does not appear to properly describe the shape of the groove. Lines 14-15 suggest that there are three parts to the groove shape – a bottom and two adjacent slant portions. None of the disclosed grooves have a separate bottom portion.

- Claim 9 appears to be contradictory. If only the locking portions contact the insulation cover, the wire fixing portions cannot be said to be "hugging" the wire. A "hug" does not consist of merely being touched by the extremity of the arms.

Appropriate corrections are required.

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 1-3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahroni (US 6,079,848) in view of Yamamoto et al. The connector of Ahroni comprises an auxiliary device 24; a base board 20 having a plurality of terminals 28 each with a pair of leading pressure contact blades with a predetermined shape; a case 23 in which said base board is mounted; a connecting portion 19 provided in said case and including wires 12, 13, 14; and a plurality of wire fixing portions 36, 36' hugging the wires. Positioning portions have a plurality of pressure contact receiving grooves (Fig. 7). The V-shaped grooves having two slant portions (as seen in Fig. 7) are formed by the blades, and therefore the shape is determined by and complimentary to the

blade shape. The wire fixing portions 36, 36' extend upwardly from the receiving grooves (See Fig. 3 and 7). Ahroni does not disclose that the grooves are pre-formed. However, Yamamoto teaches pre-formed receiving grooves (between 99, 101 and 103) to accommodate the contact blades of the apparatus. It would have been obvious to pre-form the grooves of Ahroni as taught by Yamamoto in order to prevent deformation of the contact blades during mating. In regard to claim 7, the wire fixing portions are at the top of the grooves and are, therefore, seen to extend upwardly therefrom. In as much as the generally V-shaped groove of the present invention has a bottom portion joined by two slant portions, the V-shaped groove of Ahroni can be described in the same manner.

Applicant argues that the grooves of Ahroni are "hypothetical indentations" and do not meet the limitations of the claims. However, the spaces formed by the blades of Ahroni are not hypothetical or merely based on theory. They are **shown** in Fig. 7. A structure that is shown is not hypothetical, it is **disclosed** by the reference. As to applicant's apparent argument that such these indentations are not grooves, it is noted that the difference may be one of scale or merely terminology. In this regard, it is noted that the claim makes no distinction concerning the size or scale of the grooves and therefore does not overcome the reference. Further, the present claim does not contain any structural limitations that differ from the structure shown by Ahroni irrespective of what applicant, patentee or anyone else chooses to call the feature.

The sole difference between the claimed invention and that shown by Ahroni is that the grooves of Ahroni are not pre-formed. It is this feature that is taught and rendered obvious by Yamamoto. The combination of references, for this purpose, has not been argued by applicant. In addition, applicant has not separately argued the rejection of claims 2 and 3.

Art Unit: 2833

7. Claims 4-6 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahroni in view of Yamamoto as applied to claims 1-3 above, and further in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("A.A.P.A."). Ahroni discloses the invention substantially as claimed, but does not disclose the auxiliary device being a camera module. A.A.P.A. teaches a camera module as an auxiliary device. It would have been obvious to modify the use of the device module and use it with a camera module to improve the connection between a camera module and mating component.

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The connector of Reichle comprises wire fixing portions 11 hugging the wire.

9. Claim 8 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the objections set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim.

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. It is suggested that responses to this final action be faxed to:
(703) 872-9306

Art Unit: 2833

Please refrain from sending a confirmation copy, as noted in 37 CFR 1.6(d) and 1.8(b).

Alternatively, responses may be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mrs. Renee Luebke at (571) 272-2009. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mrs. Paula Bradley, can be reached at (571) 272-2800, extension 33.



Renee S. Luebke
Primary Patent Examiner
August 10, 2004